

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were rejected in the office action. Claims 1-3, 6, and 15-25 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. No new matter has been added. Therefore, following the present response, claims 1-30 will be pending in this application.

The specification has been objected to by the Examiner, because the abstract exceeds the proscribed format. The abstract has been amended to conform with the proscribed format. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Claims 2, 3, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, claims 2, 3, and 6 stand rejected, because, according to the Office Action, the claims include insufficient antecedent basis. (*Office Action* – paragraph 7). Claims 2, 3, and 6 have been amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 3, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 18-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. More specifically, claims 18-25 stand rejected, because as asserted in the Office Action, claims 18-25 may include a form of energy or a wire medium. (*Office Action* – paragraph 7). Claims 18-25 have been amended to recite “a computer-readable storage medium.” Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 1, 3-4, 12-13, 15, 17-18, and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,435 to Boebert *et al.* (“Boebert”). Additionally, claims 2 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,512,529 to Janseen *et al.* (“Janseen”). In particular, the office action suggests that Boebert teaches “maintaining the security of data displayed on a display for a system” that includes a “secured execution environment” and a “second execution environment,” as recited in independent claims 1, 12, 15, and 26. (*Office Action* – paragraphs 10-13). Applicants respectfully disagree that Boebert teaches “maintaining the security of data displayed on a display for a system.” In fact, there is no discussion in Boebert that a

user may distinguish between decrypted data received from a host computer and unencrypted data that may be displayed in order to maintain the security of data displayed on a display.

The claimed embodiments recite techniques “for maintaining the security of data displayed on a display” of a system that includes a “secured execution environment” and a “second execution environment.” The “execution environments, such as operating systems, run side-by-side on a single machine” such that a user may “discern which graphical user interface elements originate” from the “secured execution environment” versus which graphical user interface elements originate from the “second execution environment.” (*Specification* – paragraph [0027]). In other words, a user may be able to identify which execution environment he or she may be interacting with based on the graphical user interface.

Boebert, on the other hand, discloses “secure communication over an unsecured communications medium between a user working on an unsecured workstation or computer and a host computer.” (*Boebert* – col. 3, ll. 19-22). In other words, data received from input/output devices, such as a keyboard, is encrypted by a secure interface connected to a workstation before the data is transmitted to a host computer. (See *Boebert* – col. 3, ll. 25-27; Abstract). Additionally, the secure interface receives data from the host computer, decrypts the encrypted data, and presents the data within a user-defined screen overlay. (See *Boebert* – col. 3, ll. 27-29).

Using a secure interface to encrypt data before transmission to a host computer and decrypt data received from the host computer, as described in Boebert, does not disclose “maintaining the security of data displayed on a display” of a system that includes a “secured execution environment” and a “second execution environment” where the “execution environments, such as operating systems, run side-by-side on a single machine.” Additionally, Boebert does not disclose that a user may distinguish between the graphical user interfaces of the execution environments. In fact, there is no discussion in Boebert that the user may distinguish between the decrypted data received from the host computer and unencrypted data that may be displayed. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 12, 15, and 26 patentably define over the references as applied.

In addition, claims 5-6, 7-8, 10-11, 14, 19-20, 21-22, 24-25, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert in view Ye et al. (*Trusted paths*

for browsers: An open-source solution to web spoofing, by Zishuang Ye & Sean Smith)(“Ye”) and claims 9 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boebert in view of Ye and in further view of Djamija *et al.* (*Hash visualization in user authentication*, by Rachna Djamija) (“Djamija”).

For at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to Boebert, claims 5-6, 7-8, 10-11, 14, 19-20, 21-22, 24-25, and 28-30 patentably define over Boebert in view Ye and claims 9 and 23 patentably define over Boebert in view of Ye and in further view of Djamija.

As claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, claim 6 depends from claim 5, claims 8-11 depend from claim 7, claims 13-14 depend from claim 12, claims 16-18 depend from claim 15, claim 20 depends from claim 19, claims 22-25 depend from claim 21, claim 27-28 depend from claim 26, and claim 30 depends from claim 29, applicant further respectfully submits that claims 2-4, 6, 8-11, 13-14, 16-18, 20, 22-25, 27-28, and 30 patentably define over the references as applied.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 12-13, 15, 17-18, and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Boebert; claims 2 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Boebert in view of Janseen; claims 5-6, 7-8, 10-11, 14, 19-20, 21-22, 24-25, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Boebert in view of Ye; and claims claims 9 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Boebert in view of Ye and in further view of Djamija.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2816/305955.01
Application No.: 10/691,759
Office Action Dated: February 23, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney Vincent J. Roccia at (215-564-8946).

Date: August 22, 2007

/Vincent J. Roccia/
Vincent J. Roccia
Registration No. 43,887

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439